

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 712

DE 011 540

AUTHOR Sahler, William A.
 TITLE Expansion of the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Faculty College: Evaluation Report.
 INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Oshkosh.
 SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE [78]
 NOTE 51p.; Appended evaluation questionnaires may not reproduce well.
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; College Faculty; Educational Development; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Models; *Program Evaluation; *Teacher Workshops
 IDENTIFIERS *University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

ABSTRACT

A project, sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, was conducted at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh to expand the Faculty College program, which is an on-going series of faculty development workshops and seminars. The project was designed to: implement and evaluate a series of in-depth special focus sessions that feature national leaders who would treat issues in one of the developing areas of the institution; provide support for faculty from external institutions to participate in the Faculty College program; develop alternative models for implementing comprehensive institutional change strategies that can be sustained without external resources; and assess the effectiveness of the interinstitutional multiplier strategy implemented through the project. The four special focus sessions focused on: university/high school cooperative programs, educational needs in nonschool settings, adult education, and improving undergraduate teaching. The project evaluation plan is outlined and the following conclusions are presented: the four sessions were positively evaluated by participants; 51 participating institutions derived some benefit from project experiences; and four models for implementing comprehensive institutional change strategies were developed. Responses regarding the multiplier strategy implemented through the project were mixed. Data from the evaluation studies and evaluation instruments are included. (24)

.....
 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED172712

HE

Expansion of the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh Faculty College:
Evaluation Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

William A. Mahler

University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh

HE ED11560

This project was funded by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education under grant no. S3BAW60597

The University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh received a two-year grant in 1976 from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education to expand upon its Faculty College program, which is an on-going series of workshops and seminars as part of a comprehensive Faculty Development Program. The grant was designed to enable UW-Oshkosh to "(i) implement and evaluate a series of in-depth special focus (Faculty College) sessions that include presenters from other institutions; (ii) provide support for faculty from external institutions to participate in the Faculty College program; (iii) develop alternative models for implementing comprehensive institutional change strategies that can be sustained without external resources; and (iv) assess the effectiveness of the inter-institutional multiplier strategy implemented through this project." (Project proposal, 1976)

As stipulated in the proposal, four special focus sessions were held during the two years. The sessions focused on "University/High School Cooperative Programs," (January, 1977), "Educational Needs in Non-School Settings" (May, 1977), "Adult Education" (January, 1978), and "Improving Undergraduate Teaching" (May, 1978). At each of these times, the chief academic officers of selected colleges and universities were invited to come or send a representative --with all expenses being paid by the grant. A total of 85 institutions were sent invitations, and 51 of them sent representatives. These people participated in the special focus sessions, other Faculty College sessions which were being held primarily for the benefit of the UW-Oshkosh faculty during the times of their visits, and a special workshop which was designed to acquaint them with the Oshkosh

Faculty Development Program and related aspects of the university and to help them develop ideas and plans for faculty development program at their own institutions.

Four of the institutions, which sent representatives to Oshkosh in 1977, were selected for an intensive follow-up in the spring of 1978. The project director and another member of the project staff visited each institution and conducted interviews with relevant faculty members and administrators. Teams of 5-7 faculty members and administrators then participated in a workshop which was held in Oshkosh in April of 1978. The workshop was designed to assist each team to develop institutional plans for faculty development and exchange useful ideas with other teams.

Evaluation Plan

The evaluation of this project raised a number of challenges. The evaluators wished to examine not only the reactions of the participants to the various sessions, but also the effects of participation on the faculty development activities at the participants' own institutions. The first objective was relatively straightforward, and it was decided to measure reactions through questionnaires to be completed at the end of each Oshkosh visit and through telephone follow-ups several weeks or months after each visit. The second objective was known to be much more difficult. The following problems were anticipated in trying to measure institutional effects:

1. Baseline data were needed for use in assessing any changes, yet participating institutions could not be identified in advance.
2. Institutions have different needs and could be expected to change in highly idiosyncratic ways.

3. Institutions, particularly colleges and universities with their diffuse decision-making process and emphasis on the preservation of traditional values, change very slowly in significant areas. Thus, the effects of ideas generated at Oshkosh may not show up for several years.
4. The amount of contact was relatively small (i.e., one to seven people for a few days), but the desired effects were hoped to be great (i.e., a new or increased institutional emphasis on faculty development, new program, or new ways for the institution to function).
5. A true experiment with complete randomization could not be arranged.
6. The number of participants was relatively small in view of the needs of more sophisticated measurement and statistical techniques.

The first decision made was to measure change in two complementary ways. One chosen source of data was "A Survey of Faculty Development Practices," which was conducted in the spring of 1976 by Dr. John Centra of the Educational Testing Service. Dr. Centra had responses to a four-page questionnaire from 756 colleges and universities. He agreed to provide any data he had on participating institutions, a sample of non-participating institutions and to permit the use of his questionnaire for a follow-up at the end of the project. It was recognized that this questionnaire would provide only generalized data and might not be sensitive enough to measure any changes which would occur as a result of this project, but it would provide a relatively standardized and well researched set of data for both baseline and subsequent measures.

The complementary method which was initially selected was to conduct structured telephone interviews with participants approximately six months to one year after their visits to Oshkosh. This amount of time was shorter than

desired, but was as long as could be used within the project period. Even with this shortened time, the groups which came in the spring of 1978 had not been contacted as of the writing of this report because it was not reasonable to expect them to have accomplished anything in that period. After the first group in January of 1977, it was decided to strengthen this method of data collection through the use of goal attainment scales (Kiresuk & Lund, 1975). In this method, each participant was asked at the time of the visits to indicate the areas in which they hoped to have change occur; the best, worst, and expected outcomes in those areas; the percentage of their effort which they planned to spend on each area; the points on the scales where they were at that time; and the points at which they expected to be in one year. These scales were then used as the basis for the telephone interviews.

Evaluation Staff

The evaluation was conducted primarily by Dr. William A. Mahler, Research Associate for the UW-Oshkosh Faculty Development Program, and Dr. Daniel P. Norton, Director of Research for the School District of Wausau (Wisconsin). Dr. Mahler has been an associate research psychologist for the Educational Testing Service, where he conducted several evaluations, and an instructional development consultant for the University of Delaware. Throughout the time of this grant, he was employed primarily by the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh to conduct an evaluation of its entire Faculty Development Programs under a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc. He was also an active participant in the planning, coordinating, and presenting of these workshops. Dr. Norton was the Director of Research for the Mid-West Regional Office of the Educational Testing Service and has conducted numerous evaluations at all levels of education. Able consultation and assistance were provided by Dr. John Centra, who developed the

"Survey of Faculty Development Practices" and conducted the 1976 study using that instrument, and Dr. Arden Groteleuschen of the Office for the Study of Continuing Professional Education at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. This report was written by Dr. Mahler, who accepts full responsibility for its contents.

Participant Reactions to Faculty College Sessions

Near the end of their visits to Oshkosh, each person was asked to respond to ten questions regarding the special focus session, the workshop on the Oshkosh Faculty Development Program, and any other Faculty College sessions attended. Responses were on the following scale:

Definitely No	No	Neutral	Yes	Definitely Yes
1	2	3	4	5

Table 1 presents the mean ratings for the special focus sessions. The top number in each cell of the table is the rating by the people whose attendance was sponsored by this grant, and the lower number is the rating by all other people. Table 2 presents the mean ratings for the workshops which were held to present the Oshkosh Faculty Development Program and related aspects of the university and to assist participants in formulating plans for increasing faculty development activities on their own campuses. The other Faculty College sessions were so diverse and attendance by these people was so sporadic that the presentation of aggregate data would be meaningless. Since these other sessions were not supported by this grant and are evaluated through other mechanisms, no data will be presented. Suffice it to say that some of the experiences were viewed positively and some were not. Participant reactions are used regularly by the Oshkosh Faculty Development Board to improve the quality of these offerings.

The people who attended the first workshop in January, 1977 were all called approximately two weeks after their visit by Dr. Mahler. All participants expressed very positive reactions to their visit. Some suggestions about the schedule of activities were made, and the schedule was changed for subsequent visits. One change was that sessions of the special workshop were held both in the early mornings and in the evening, rather than just in the evenings, so that the number of days could be shortened without interfering with the other Faculty College sessions or reducing the material covered. The other change was that the opening session was on Sunday evening, instead of Monday evening, so that visitors could learn some basics about the university and its Faculty Development Program before attending any Faculty College Sessions. This schedule also seemed to be better in terms of encouraging people to arrive in time for the first session. The only criticisms were related to the accommodations, which were changed from an on-campus dormitory for the first group to a nearby motel for subsequent groups, and the weather. (The night before the first group arrived was the coldest in Wisconsin history with the temperature in Oshkosh reaching -35 degrees F. There was also a fairly substantial snowstorm passing through the midwest at that time, which caused one person to be a day late and another to give up entirely.)

Approximately 4-5 months after the first group had been to Oshkosh, Dr. Norton telephoned each of them again. His report can be found as Appendix A. He found that "one final respondent expressed a neutral position with regard to the total value of the conference; all others were strongly or extremely positive."

Telephone calls to the people who attended the May, 1977 and January, 1978 sessions were made by Dr. Norton during May and June of 1978. A major portion of these conversations dealt with the "goal attainment scales," which will be

discussed in a future section of this paper. He also asked them to respond to the following:

"I now rate the effectiveness of the program I participated in at Oshkosh as

- 1-- Not very worthwhile
- 2-- Somewhat worthwhile
- 3-- Worthwhile
- 4-- Very worthwhile."

Of the people who attended in May, 1977 and who could be reached by telephone, two said "somewhat worthwhile," four said "worthwhile," and four said "very worthwhile." Of the people who attended in January, 1978 and who could be reached by telephone, nine said "worthwhile" and five said "very worthwhile." These data are also contained in Appendix B.

Some additional data were collected from some participants, particularly those in the first groups. Since these data were used for formative purposes and are not pertinent to the outcome evaluation described in this report, they are not included. A copy of the open-ended questionnaire which was sent to the participants in the first workshop can be found as Appendix C. Similar questionnaires were used for the other groups. The responses were used in planning workshop activities. Also the people in the first group were asked in their first telephone interview to rate their institution's existing faculty development program, their own backgrounds in this type of work, and the prognosis for change at their institutions. Each person and institution was also rated on the same scales by the project/workshop leader (Dr. Gueths) and by Dr. Mahler right after their visits. These data were used in selecting institutions for the follow-up activities in the spring of 1978.

Survey of Faculty Development Practices

In the spring of 1976, Dr. John Centra of the Educational Testing Service surveyed all post-secondary educational institutions in the country with regard to their faculty development practices. He sent a four-page questionnaire (Appendix D) to the 1044 institutions which responded positively to an initial inquiry as to whether they had "an organized program or set of practices for faculty development and improving instruction." Completed questionnaires were received from 756 institutions, and the results have been widely reported (Centra, 1976).

Since this project was interested in reaching institutions which could most benefit from a visit to Oshkosh, we approached Dr. Centra with a request to obtain the names of institutions which had shown enough interest to respond to his questionnaire but had only minimal faculty development practices. The criterion used was that the institutions had to score in the lower half on all four factors identified in the original study. Some of the schools in this group were not invited to Oshkosh but were retained as a control group, and some additional schools were invited because they either expressed interest in learning about the Oshkosh Faculty Development Program or were middle-sized, state-supported universities that were similar in character to UM-Oshkosh (a group that was under-represented in the "Centra sample").

An agreement was reached to allow the evaluation of this project to use the data from the 1976 study for all institutions in the indicated sample plus all others who attended the Oshkosh sessions. Permission to use the questionnaires for a follow-up survey in 1978 was also given. In an effort to minimize any bias which may have resulted from having the 1978 survey sent by and returned to UM-Oshkosh, arrangements were made to have this done by Dr. Arden Groteleuschen of the Office for the Study of Continuing Professional Education at the University

of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. A total of 118 questionnaires were distributed, and 75 useable responses were received. Of these, 41 questionnaires came from institutions which were never invited to Oshkosh, 24 came from institutions which were participants in this project, and 10 came from institutions which were invited but did not attend. The questionnaires were addressed to the person who completed the 1976 questionnaire (or his/her successor) along with that person's title and address as given on the 1976 survey. 57% of the 1978 questionnaires were completed by the same person who completed the 1976 questionnaire, and 50% of the 1978 questionnaires from institutions which sent representatives to Oshkosh were completed by the person who actually came.

The data from Sections IA, IB, IC, ID, IE, IV, VA, and VB are presented in Tables 3-10, respectively. In the columns labeled "Workshop Participation," P stands for "Participants," R stands for "Refused Invitation," and C stands for the "Control" group. Analyses of variance were performed separately on the estimated use and estimated effectiveness responses in each of the first five sections. With the level of significance set at $\alpha = .05$, the following effects were found to be significant:

	<u>Estimated Use</u>	<u>Estimated Effectiveness</u>
Table 3	Workshop Participation	None
Table 4	Workshop Participation and Year	None
Table 5	Workshop Participation	Workshop Participation
Table 6	Workshop Participation and Year	None
Table 7	Workshop Participation and Year	Interaction of 2 Main Effects

On the basis of this chart, we can see that very few significant changes occurred in the estimates of the effectiveness of these faculty development practices. As far as the estimated extent of faculty use of these practices, we can see that

the three groups varied significantly from each other and that significant changes occurred in three of the five areas. However, to demonstrate that the workshops actually had any effects, we would need to see significant interactions between the two main effects. Since the only significant interaction occurred in the estimated effectiveness of one section, we must conclude that the Oshkosh workshops had no significant effects on these data. There were differences between the three groups, undoubtedly due to the non-random selection procedure. The lack of significant interaction effects is not too surprising in view of the measurement problems previously discussed and the general nature of this questionnaire.

It was not deemed appropriate to use inferential statistics with the data in Tables 8-10, but some interesting results were reported. The only group to show increases in extent of estimated involvement was the group which refused participation in the project. In regard to the funding questions, the differences are quite small but again the only group to show increases in institutional funding, a major theme of the workshops, was the group which refused participation. For the closely related question of whether the institution's budget support for faculty had increased, decreased, or remained the same over the previous two years, the following percentages of 1978 respondents gave the indicated responses:

	Increase	Decrease	Same
P	48%	9%	43%
R	30%	0%	70%
C	39%	3%	58%

These data conflict directly with the data in Table 10, and so both sets of data must be viewed with extreme caution.

The number of institutions reporting an on-campus person or unit for faculty development or instructional improvement increased for all three groups, and participation in a consortium or regional group that concentrates on faculty development increased for each group except the workshop participants. All groups also showed increases in the number of evaluations of their faculty development efforts.

Goal Attainment Scales

During the spring of 1977, it was decided to strengthen the telephone follow-ups through the use of the goal attainment scaling (GAS) method. This method was originally designed for use in evaluating mental health programs (Kiresuck & Lund, 1975) and was adapted for use with faculty development activities for the first time. Under this adapted method, each Oshkosh visitor was asked to identify one to five goal areas "in which (he/she) would like to see changes occur in (his/her) institution or personal responsibilities." Each was then asked to write a few words to describe the expected level of success in each area (given an unlimited time frame), the best and worst possible outcomes, and intermediate outcomes if possible. The third step was to indicate the percentage of personal or institutional development effort that should go into each goal. Finally, the participant was asked to indicate where on each scale they were at that time and where they expected to be in one year. A completed form from one of the visitors is attached as Appendix E.

The GAS method seems to have two distinct advantages. First of all, the very act of completing such a form seemed to help participants apply what had been discussed in the workshop to their own institutions, and the form gave them a concrete, albeit scanty, plan to take with them. In a recent review and critique of the GAS method, Calsyn and Davidson (1978) acknowledged that it

"is highly useful as a therapeutic and/or program management tool." Although this language might be offensive in relation to faculty development, the basic concept has proven useful. The second advantage is that this method give the evaluator individualized, specific scales against which to measure progress. The quantifiable data which can then be obtained can be used in various ways. Some methodological and psychometric issues still need to be resolved (Calsyn and Davidson, 1978), but the basic method seems to hold great promise. Because it has not yet been time to follow-up on the people who came in May, 1978, we have not yet done a complete analysis of these data. Our preliminary analysis, as indicated in Appendix B, shows that each person from the January, 1978 and May, 1977 groups reported some progress on their goals. We are in agreement with Calsyn and Davidson that this method should not be the sole form of evaluation.

Conclusions

This project has successfully met all of its stated objectives, as follows:

- i) implement and evaluate a series of in-depth special focus (Faculty College) sessions that include presenters from other institutions

Four sessions were held and are reported in detail in the main project report. All were positively evaluated by participants with the more participatory ones being more positively regarded.

- ii) provide support for faculty from external institutions to participate in the Faculty College program

Representatives from fifty-one institutions participated in this project. All indicated that they derived some benefit and rated their experiences as "somewhat" to "very worthwhile." These positive reactions were found immediately after the visits and up to one year later.

- iii) develop alternative models for implementing comprehensive institutional change strategies that can be sustained without external resources

Four models, in addition to a refinement of the Oshkosh model, were developed at a workshop in the spring of 1978. The workshop participants from the five institutions are currently working on their acceptance and implementation. A complete report is in preparation.

- iv) assess the effectiveness of the inter-institutional multiplier strategy implemented through this project.

The effectiveness of this strategy has been assessed, and the results are mixed. All of the individuals involved reported changes in their ideas and approaches toward faculty development. Most also reported some (minimal) progress toward institutional change. However, a standardized questionnaire, which was usually completed by people who did not participate in project activities, did not verify these results. It showed differences between participants and non-participants but not as a result of participation; that is, there was no significant interaction between whether an institution sent a representative and whether there were changes in their faculty development practices from 1976 to 1978. We believe that this lack of significant effects on the questionnaire responses is caused partly by the insensitivity of such instruments and partly by the slowness of perceptible change in colleges and universities. However, the possibility remains that project participants were enthusiastic but had no real impact on their institutions within the timeframe of the study. We believe that the "inter-institutional multiplier strategy" showed enough promise to warrant further trials and study.

TABLE 1
Mean Ratings for Special Focus Faculty College Sessions

	Jan. 77	May 77	Jan. 78	May 78
1. Was the program interesting	4.3 4.3	3.5 N.A.	4.4 4.3	4.4 4.1
2. Were the individual sessions well organized?	4.2 4.2	3.8 N.A.	4.5 4.2	4.4 4.2
3. Were individual sessions properly properly integrated with each other?	3.8 4.0	3.6 N.A.	4.0 4.0	4.0 3.5
4. Was the subject matter considered at an appropriate level of depth?	3.9 4.2	3.6 N.A.	4.1 4.0	4.3 3.5
5. . . . appropriate level of breadth?	3.8 4.2	3.5 N.A.	4.0 4.1	4.3 3.6
6. Were the number and length of sessions appropriate for the subject matter involved?	3.5 4.1	3.3 N.A.	3.9 3.8	4.1 3.6
7. Was the quality of instruction for the program adequate?	3.9 4.1	3.7 N.A.	4.3 4.1	4.2 4.0
8. Were your involvement and effort as a participant adequate?	3.6 3.5	3.0 N.A.	3.7 3.7	3.9 3.6
9. Did this program make a worth-while contribution to your professional growth?	3.8 4.2	3.2 N.A.	4.2 3.9	4.1 3.7
10. Would you recommend this particular Faculty College program to other faculty?	3.8 4.0	3.5 N.A.	4.3 4.2	3.9 4.0
TOTALS	3.9 4.2	3.4 N.A.	4.1 4.0	4.2 3.8

TABLE 2
Mean Ratings for Faculty Development Workshop

	Jan. 77	May 77	Jan. 78	May 78
1. Was the program interesting?	4.4	4.7	4.5	4.3
2. Were the individual sessions well organized?	4.8	4.6	4.2	4.4
3. Were individual sessions properly integrated with each other?	4.5	4.4	4.0	3.8
4. Was the subject matter considered at an appropriate level of depth?	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.9
5. . . . appropriate level of breadth?	4.6	4.2	4.0	4.4
6. Were the number and length of sessions appropriate for the subject matter involved?	3.8	4.2	4.0	3.1
7. Was the quality of instruction for this program adequate?	4.6	4.4	4.3	4.3
8. Were your involvement and effort as a participant adequate?	4.0	4.3	4.1	3.6
9. Did this program make a worth-while contribution to your professional growth?	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.2
10. Would you recommend this particular Faculty College program to other faculty?	4.4	4.6	4.4	3.6
TOTAL	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.0

TABLE 3

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Development Practices--Workshops,
Seminars, Program--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Partici- pation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
Workshops, seminars, program--	P	1.79	1.79	2.05	2.05
1. that explore various methods or techniques of instruction	R	1.10	1.40	1.57	2.00
	C	1.88	2.10	2.14	2.67
2. that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field	P	1.21	1.54	1.81	1.95
	R	0.80	1.80	1.60	2.25
	C	1.05	1.32	1.79	2.00
3. dealing with new or different approaches to develop curricula	P	1.00	1.04	1.85	1.79
	R	0.40	0.87	2.00	1.33
	C	1.10	1.19	1.80	2.12
4. on testing and evaluating student performance	P	0.83	1.08	1.47	1.62
	R	0.70	0.70	1.00	1.40
	C	0.66	1.49	1.42	2.45
5. to acquaint faculty with goals of the institution and types of students enrolled	P	1.42	1.29	2.44	2.21
	R	1.40	1.60	2.80	2.67
	C	2.02	2.44	2.96	3.45
6. to help faculty improve their academic advising and counseling skills	P	1.29	1.42	1.82	2.00
	R	1.30	1.30	2.17	2.17
	C	1.39	1.73	2.28	2.73
7. to help faculty improve their research and scholarship skills	P	0.50	0.67	1.33	1.78
	R	0.30	1.10	1.50	2.20
	C	0.22	0.39	1.50	1.40
8. to improve the management of departmental operations	P	0.79	0.75	1.73	1.38
	R	0.30	0.60	1.00	1.50
	C	0.63	1.07	2.17	2.20
9. that explore general issues or trends in education	P	1.37	1.17	1.94	1.87
	R	0.90	1.70	2.00	2.83
	C	1.54	1.51	2.48	2.70
10. in faculty effective development--improving interpersonal skills or their ability to work effectively in groups, exploring educational values, and similar topics	P	0.75	0.83	1.38	1.67
	R	0.30	1.00	1.00	2.50
	C	1.00	1.05	2.16	2.15
TOTALS	P	1.12	1.16	1.80	1.83
	R	0.70	1.20	1.76	2.09
	C	1.15	1.44	2.07	2.43

TABLE 4

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Analysis or Assessment Practices,
by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Partici- pation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
<u>Analysis or Assessment Practices</u>					
1. Systematic ratings of instruction by students used to help faculty improve	P R C	2.96 3.40 3.32	3.46 3.60 3.44	3.23 3.40 3.40	3.61 3.60 3.61
2. Formal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement (i.e., visitations or use of assessment form)	P R C	1.37 0.90 0.80	1.58 1.50 1.22	2.06 1.50 1.83	2.23 1.87 2.27
3. Informal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement	P R C	1.67 0.90 1.15	1.58 1.90 1.90	2.35 1.50 1.96	2.00 2.37 2.36
4. Systematic teaching or course evaluations by an administrator for improvement purposes	P R C	1.54 0.30 1.44	1.50 0.50 1.54	2.47 1.50 2.81	2.77 1.25 3.00
5. System for faculty to assess their own strengths and areas needing improvement	P R C	1.75 0.30 1.49	1.17 0.90 1.00	2.62 1.50 2.65	2.33 2.25 2.22
6. Classroom visitation by an instructional resource person (i.e., a development specialist), upon request, followed by a diagnosis of teaching	P R C	0.17 0.10 0.27	0.37 0.30 0.49	1.33 1.00 1.83	1.29 1.00 1.67
7. Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction	P R C	0.62 0.40 0.41	0.87 0.80 0.66	1.07 1.00 1.21	1.23 1.33 1.42
8. Faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on teaching or course improvement	P R C	0.75 0.60 0.90	0.79 1.20 1.27	1.38 1.50 1.42	1.36 1.71 1.93
9. "Master teachers" or senior faculty work closely with new or apprentice teachers	P R C	0.54 0.00 0.44	0.54 0.30 0.64	1.44 0.00 1.64	1.44 1.50 1.62
10. Professional and personal development plan (sometimes called a growth contract) for individual faculty members	P R C	0.50 0.30 0.37	0.67 0.70 0.83	2.40 1.50 2.14	1.78 1.00 2.12
TOTALS	P R C	1.19 0.72 1.06	1.75 1.12 1.38	2.04 1.44 2.09	2.00 1.79 2.30

TABLE 5

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Development Practices--Media, Technology,
Course Development--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Partici- pation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
<u>Media, technology, course development</u>					
1. Specialists on campus to assist faculty in use of audiovisual aids in instruction, including closed-circuit television	P R C	1.62 1.00 1.41	1.50 1.40 1.66	2.29 2.00 2.32	2.12 2.00 2.72
2. Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid (e.g., programmed learning or computer-assisted instruction)	P R C	1.29 0.85 0.91	1.12 1.00 1.19	1.82 1.50 1.54	1.50 1.25 2.23
3. Specialists to assist faculty in constructing tests or evaluating student performance	P R C	0.50 0.10 0.29	0.71 0.30 0.56	1.71 1.00 1.60	1.70 1.50 2.30
4. Specialists to assist individual faculty in instructional or course development by consulting on course objectives and course design	P R C	0.54 0.20 0.22	0.96 0.10 0.66	1.44 1.00 1.80	1.92 1.00 1.93
5. Specialists to help faculty develop teaching skills such as lecturing or leading dis- cussions, or to encourage use of different teaching-learning strategies such as individualized instruction	P R C	0.50 0.10 0.49	0.54 0.60 0.66	1.71 1.00 2.22	1.44 1.20 2.08
6. Simulated procedures that enable faculty to learn and practice specific teaching skills (e.g., micro-teaching)	P R C	0.33 0.00 0.27	0.50 0.30 0.34	1.33 ----- 1.57	1.33 1.50 1.75
7. Special professional library readily accessible to faculty dealing with instructional methodology, teaching and similar topics	P R C	0.75 0.20 1.05	1.00 0.80 1.29	1.80 1.00 1.79	2.18 1.60 2.12
TOTALS	P R C	0.79 0.31 0.66	0.90 0.64 0.91	1.73 1.07 1.62	1.74 1.44 2.16

TABLE 6

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Miscellaneous Development

Practice--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Partici- pation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
<u>Miscellaneous practices</u>					
1. Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching	P	1.33	1.42	1.92	1.62
	R	1.10	1.50	1.37	1.67
	C	1.12	1.32	1.64	2.08
2. Visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of this institu- tion) to review educational programs or innovative projects	P	1.12	1.17	1.35	1.33
	R	0.90	0.90	1.29	1.27
	C	1.32	1.19	1.69	1.81
3. Faculty exchange program with other institutions	P	0.50	0.46	1.20	1.10
	R	0.00	0.40	----	1.00
	C	0.17	0.27	1.00	1.10
4. Faculty take courses offered by colleagues	P	1.04	1.04	1.32	1.25
	R	0.70	0.90	1.00	1.12
	C	0.83	1.00	1.10	1.37
5. Personal counseling provided individual faculty members on career goals, and other personal development areas	P	0.50	0.42	1.50	1.25
	R	0.60	0.60	1.50	1.20
	C	0.63	0.76	1.86	2.21
TOTALS	P	0.90	0.90	1.38	1.31
	R	0.64	0.86	1.03	1.25
	C	0.81	0.91	1.29	1.71

TABLE 7

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Institution-Wide
Policies or Practices in Development--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Partici- pation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
1. Annual awards to faculty for excellence in teaching	P B C	1.58 1.40 1.71	1.29 1.50 1.63	1.58 1.40 1.71	1.41 1.50 1.72
2. Circulation of newsletter, articles, etc. that are pertinent to teaching improvement or faculty development	P B C	1.46 1.70 1.39	1.17 1.70 1.37	1.46 1.70 1.39	1.27 1.70 1.36
3. A specific calendar period to set aside for professional development	P B C	1.79 1.90 1.66	1.54 1.99 1.54	1.79 1.90 1.66	1.68 1.90 1.61
4. There is periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not	P B C	1.33 1.40 1.29	1.17 1.40 1.19	1.33 1.40 1.29	1.22 1.40 1.22
5. Sabbatical leaves with at least half salary	B B C	1.37 1.30 1.37	1.21 1.10 1.27	1.37 1.30 1.37	1.30 1.10 1.33
6. A policy of unpaid leaves that covers educational or development purposes	P B C	1.17 1.40 1.29	1.00 1.30 1.24	1.22 1.40 1.33	1.04 1.30 1.31
7. Lighter than normal teaching load for first year faculty	P B C	1.83 1.90 1.80	1.71 1.80 1.78	1.83 1.90 1.80	1.86 2.00 1.87
8. Temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area	P B C	1.37 1.30 1.49	1.08 1.50 1.46	1.37 1.30 1.46	1.18 1.50 1.50
9. Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field	P B C	1.58 1.60 1.56	1.25 1.50 1.36	1.58 1.60 1.56	1.30 1.50 1.48
10. Travel funds available to attend professional conferences	P B C	1.04 1.00 1.02	0.96 1.10 1.05	1.04 1.00 1.02	1.00 1.10 1.07
11. Visiting scholars program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods	P B C	1.25 1.50 1.68	1.17 1.40 1.48	1.25 1.50 1.72	1.20 1.40 1.56
12. Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses	P B C	1.42 1.50 1.50	1.21 1.60 1.46	1.42 1.50 1.56	1.30 1.60 1.54
13. There is a campus committee on faculty development	P B C	1.46 1.80 1.56	1.25 1.40 1.34	1.46 1.80 1.56	1.36 1.40 1.41
TOTALS	P B C	1.43 1.52 1.49	1.23 1.49 1.39	1.44 1.51 1.50	1.37 1.49 1.40

TABLE 3

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Development Practices--Workshops.

Seminars, Program--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Participation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
Workshops, seminars, program--	P	1.79	1.79	2.06	2.06
1. that explore various methods or techniques of instruction	R	1.10	1.40	1.67	2.00
	C	1.88	2.10	2.14	2.67
2. that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field	P	1.21	1.54	1.81	1.96
	R	0.80	1.80	1.40	2.25
	C	1.06	1.32	1.79	2.00
3. dealing with new or different approaches to develop curricula	P	1.00	1.04	1.85	1.79
	R	0.40	0.80	2.00	1.33
	C	1.10	1.29	1.80	2.12
4. on testing and evaluating student performance	P	0.83	1.08	1.67	1.62
	R	0.70	0.70	1.00	1.40
	C	0.66	1.49	1.42	2.65
5. to acquaint faculty with goals of the institution and types of students enrolled	P	1.62	1.29	2.44	2.21
	R	1.40	1.80	2.80	2.67
	C	2.02	2.44	2.96	3.45
6. to help faculty improve their academic advising and counseling skills	P	1.29	1.42	1.82	2.00
	R	1.30	1.30	2.17	2.17
	C	1.38	1.73	2.28	2.73
7. to help faculty improve their research and scholarship skills	P	0.90	0.67	1.33	1.78
	R	0.30	1.10	1.50	2.20
	C	0.22	0.39	1.50	1.60
8. to improve the management of departmental operations	P	0.79	0.75	1.73	1.58
	R	0.30	0.60	1.00	1.50
	C	0.63	1.07	2.17	2.20
9. that explore general issues or trends in education	P	1.37	1.17	1.94	1.87
	R	0.90	1.70	3.00	2.83
	C	1.56	1.61	2.46	2.70
10. in faculty effective development--improving interpersonal skills or their ability to work effectively in groups, exploring educational values, and similar topics	P	0.75	0.83	1.38	1.67
	R	0.30	1.00	1.00	2.50
	C	1.00	1.06	2.16	2.15
TOTALS	P	1.12	1.16	1.80	1.83
	R	0.70	1.20	1.76	2.09
	C	1.16	1.44	2.07	2.43

TABLE 4

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Analysis or Assessment Practices,
by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Partici- pation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
Analysis or Assessment Practices					
1. Systematic ratings of instruction by students used to help faculty improve	P	2.96	3.46	3.23	3.61
	R	3.40	3.60	3.40	3.60
	C	3.32	3.44	3.40	3.61
2. Formal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement (i.e., visitations or use of assessment forms)	P	1.37	1.58	2.06	2.23
	R	0.90	1.50	1.50	1.87
	C	0.80	1.22	1.83	2.27
3. Informal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement	P	1.67	1.58	2.35	2.00
	R	0.90	1.90	1.50	2.37
	C	1.15	1.90	1.96	2.36
4. Systematic teaching or course evaluations by an administrator for improvement purposes	P	1.54	1.50	2.47	2.77
	R	0.30	0.50	1.50	1.25
	C	1.44	1.54	2.81	3.00
5. System for faculty to assess their own strengths and areas needing improvement	P	1.75	1.17	2.62	2.33
	R	0.30	0.90	1.50	2.25
	C	1.49	1.80	2.65	3.22
6. Classroom visitation by an instructional resource person (i.e., a development specialist), upon request, followed by a diagnosis of teaching	P	0.17	0.37	1.33	1.29
	R	0.10	0.30	1.00	1.00
	C	0.27	0.49	1.83	1.67
7. Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction	P	0.62	0.87	1.07	1.23
	R	0.40	0.80	1.00	1.33
	C	0.41	0.66	1.21	1.42
8. Faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on teaching or course improvement	P	0.75	0.79	1.38	1.36
	R	0.60	1.20	1.50	1.71
	C	0.90	1.27	1.42	1.93
9. "Master teachers" or senior faculty work closely with new, or apprentice teachers	P	0.54	0.54	1.44	1.44
	R	0.00	0.30	0.00	1.50
	C	0.44	0.64	1.64	1.62
10. Professional and personal development plan (sometimes called a growth contract) for individual faculty members	P	0.50	0.67	2.40	1.78
	R	0.30	0.70	1.50	1.00
	C	0.37	0.83	2.14	2.12
TOTALS	P	1.19	1.25	2.04	2.00
	R	0.72	1.17	1.44	1.79
	C	1.06	1.38	2.09	2.32

TABLE 5

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Development Practices--Media, Technology,
Course Development--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Partici- pation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
<u>Media, technology, course development</u>					
1. Specialists on campus to assist faculty in use of audiovisual aids in instruction, including closed-circuit television	P R C	1.62 1.00 1.41	1.90 1.40 1.66	2.29 2.00 2.32	2.12 2.00 2.72
2. Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid (e.g., programmed learning or computer-assisted instruction)	P R C	1.29 0.60 0.90	1.12 1.00 1.19	1.82 1.50 1.64	1.50 1.25 2.23
3. Specialists to assist faculty in constructing tests or evaluating student performance	P R C	0.50 0.10 0.29	0.71 0.30 0.56	1.71 1.00 1.50	1.70 1.50 2.30
4. Specialists to assist individual faculty in instructional or course development by consulting on course objectives and course design	P R C	0.54 0.20 0.22	0.96 0.10 0.66	1.44 1.00 1.80	1.92 1.00 1.93
5. Specialists to help faculty develop teaching skills such as lecturing or leading dis- cussions, or to encourage use of different teaching-learning strategies such as individualized instruction	P R C	0.50 0.10 0.49	0.54 0.60 0.66	1.71 1.00 2.22	1.44 1.20 2.08
6. Simulated procedures that enable faculty to learn and practice specific teaching skills (e.g., micro-teaching)	P R C	0.33 0.00 0.27	0.50 0.30 0.34	1.33 ----- 1.57	1.33 1.50 1.75
7. Special professional library readily accessible to faculty dealing with instructional methodology, teaching and similar topics	P R C	0.75 0.20 1.05	1.00 0.80 1.29	1.80 1.00 1.79	2.18 1.60 2.12
TOTALS	P R C	0.79 0.31 0.66	0.90 0.64 0.91	1.73 1.07 1.82	1.74 1.44 2.16

TABLE 6

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Miscellaneous Development

Practice--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Partici- pation	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
<u>Miscellaneous practices</u>					
1. Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching	P R C	1.33 1.10 1.12	1.42 1.50 1.32	1.52 1.37 1.64	1.62 1.67 2.08
2. Visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of this institution) to review educational programs or innovative projects	P R C	1.12 0.90 1.32	1.17 0.90 1.19	1.35 1.29 1.69	1.33 1.27 1.81
3. Faculty exchange program with other institutions	P R C	0.50 0.00 0.17	0.46 0.40 0.27	1.20 ----- 1.00	1.10 1.00 1.10
4. Faculty take courses offered by colleagues	P R C	1.04 0.70 0.83	1.04 0.90 1.00	1.32 1.00 1.10	1.25 1.12 1.37
5. Personal counseling provided individual faculty members on career goals, and other personal development areas	P R C	0.50 0.60 0.63	0.42 0.60 0.76	1.50 1.50 1.86	1.25 1.20 2.21
TOTALS	P R C	0.90 0.66 0.81	0.90 0.86 0.91	1.38 1.03 1.29	1.31 1.25 1.71

TABLE B

Estimated Extent to Which Various Groups of Faculty
Have Been Involved in Development Activities

		Extent of Estimated Involvement	
		1976	1978
1. Younger faculty in their first years of teaching	P R C	2.30 2.00 2.82	2.25 2.40 2.57
2. Faculty with over 15 or 20 years of teaching experience	P R C	2.22 1.50 1.95	1.86 1.70 2.08
3. Nontenured faculty	P R C	2.48 2.00 2.64	2.29 2.30 2.65
4. Tenured faculty	P R C	2.30 1.50 2.29	2.06 1.90 2.41
5. Good teachers who want to get better	P R C	2.91 2.37 3.15	2.81 2.70 3.05
6. Faculty who really need to improve	P R C	1.48 1.25 1.62	1.43 1.40 1.78
TOTALS	P R C	2.28 1.77 2.41	2.11 2.07 2.42

TABLE 7

Estimated Use and Effectiveness of Institution-Wide
Policies or Practices in Development--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Participa- tion	Estimated Extent of Faculty Use		Estimated Effectiveness	
		1976	1978	1976	1978
1. Annual awards to faculty for excellence in teaching	P B C	1.58 1.40 1.71	1.79 1.50 1.43	1.58 1.40 1.71	1.41 1.50 1.72
2. Circulation of newsletter, articles, etc. that are pertinent to teaching improvement or faculty development	P B C	1.46 1.70 1.39	1.17 1.70 1.32	1.46 1.70 1.39	1.27 1.70 1.36
3. A specific calendar period is set aside for professional development	P B C	1.79 1.90 1.66	1.54 1.90 1.54	1.79 1.90 1.66	1.68 1.90 1.61
4. There is a periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not	P B C	1.33 1.40 1.39	1.17 1.40 1.19	1.33 1.40 1.39	1.22 1.40 1.22
5. Sabbatical leaves with at least half salary	P B C	1.37 1.30 1.37	1.21 1.10 1.27	1.37 1.30 1.37	1.32 1.10 1.23
6. A policy of unpaid leaves that covers educational or development purposes	P B C	1.17 1.40 1.39	1.00 1.30 1.24	1.17 1.40 1.33	1.06 1.30 1.21
7. Lighter than normal teaching load for first year faculty	P B C	1.83 1.90 1.90	1.71 1.80 1.78	1.83 1.90 1.90	1.66 2.00 1.87
8. Temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area	P B C	1.37 1.30 1.49	1.08 1.50 1.44	1.37 1.30 1.40	1.18 1.50 1.50
9. Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field	P B C	1.58 1.60 1.54	1.25 1.60 1.34	1.58 1.60 1.54	1.30 1.50 1.49
10. Travel funds available to attend professional conferences	P B C	1.94 1.60 1.62	0.90 1.10 1.05	1.94 1.60 1.62	1.60 1.10 1.67
11. Visiting scholars program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods	P B C	1.25 1.50 1.65	1.17 1.40 1.49	1.25 1.50 1.72	1.22 1.40 1.56
12. Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses	P B C	1.42 1.60 1.58	1.21 1.60 1.46	1.42 1.50 1.58	1.32 1.60 1.54
13. There is a campus committee on faculty development	P B C	1.46 1.80 1.56	1.25 1.40 1.34	1.46 1.80 1.56	1.36 1.40 1.41
TOTALS	P B C	1.43 1.52 1.49	1.23 1.48 1.36	1.44 1.51 1.50	1.37 1.49 1.40

TABLE 9

Estimated Proportion of Faculty Development Funds
Coming from Designated Sources--by Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Participation	Estimated Proportions	
		1976	1978
Institutional general fund	P	72.74%	59.35%
	R	70.00%	78.62%
	C	83.58%	69.58%
Grant from federal government or foundation	P	21.22%	22.83%
	R	15.00%	20.12%
	C	13.17%	21.33%
Direct funds from the state	P	3.22%	7.17%
	R	0.71%	0 %
	C	2.97%	2.53%
Other	P	2.82%	6.74%
	R	14.29%	1.25%
	C	0.28%	6.56%

TABLE 10

Percent of Respondents with Designated Percentages of Annual
Institutional Budget Going for Faculty Development--
By Workshop Participation and Year

	Workshop Participation	Percent of Respondents	
		1976	1978
0-1%	P	70%	71%
	R	67%	80%
	C	73%	68%
2-4%	P	30%	29%
	R	33%	20%
	C	24%	26%
5-7%	P	0%	0%
	R	0%	0%
	C	3%	3%
8-10%	P	0%	0%
	R	0%	0%
	C	0%	3%
Over 10%	P	0%	0%
	R	0%	0%
	C	0%	0%

APPENDIX A

End-of-Year Followup Outcomes
for the
January 1977 UW-Goshish Faculty Development Conference

Prepared by
Dr. Daniel F. Norton

September 1977

END-OF-YEAR FOLLOWUP OUTCOMES

FOR

JANUARY 1977 UW-OSHKOSH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE

Abstract

Each of eleven January conference participants received two followup telephone calls. The first was made by a UW-Oshkosh project staff member; the second was made by this writer. Second followup calls were made over an interval from May through August; the last call was delayed because of communication difficulties during the summer recess.

One final respondent expressed a neutral position with regard to the total value of the conference; all others were strongly or extremely positive. The resources institutions made available to their representatives for action after attendance varied widely. Institutional representatives with substantial resources available to them most often produced subsequent planning or program action. Those with few resources gained ideas for action alternatives that might later be pursued. Discussion about new alternatives for institutional function had been initiated.

These quotations are illustrative of those made by attendees when interviewed at years' end:

1. I cannot see any benefits that may accrue in the future.
2. It helped greatly to have been present and experience first hand the UW-Oshkosh experience.
3. I have no question but that the money spent on both ends was well spent.
4. Was very useful, - especially the eye-opening features of things going on.
5. Enjoyed immensely meeting the other people.
6. It was very interesting . . . one of the best . . . very well put together.

END-OF-YEAR FOLLOWUP OUTCOMES
FOR
JANUARY 1977 UW-OSHKOSH FACULTY DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCE

Introduction

The information herein describes the second followup responses of eleven persons who attended the January 1977 Faculty Development Conference sponsored by the UW-Oshkosh with funding provided by the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE). The writer called each attendee at or after the end of the 1976-77 academic year. Each attendee was invited to comment on (1) personal benefits derived from attendance, (2) present institutional operations relevant to attendance, and (3) future institutional activities.

Responses to these questions are listed as interpretive descriptions and quotations in the sections that follow.

One final respondent expressed a neutral position with regard to the total value of the conference; all others were strongly or extremely positive.

Contributions to Personal Effectiveness

Attendees were asked: *Did you receive help in your personal activities on behalf of faculty development?* The following comments were received:

1. It was very interesting . . . one of the best . . . very well put together.
2. I got quite a bit more out of that than I have gotten from similar sessions in the past. Oshkosh really did an outstanding job.
3. The program was stimulating and interesting. In general, it was worth attending.
4. Helps greatly to have been present and experience first hand the Oshkosh experience.
5. I have since gone to a conference in New Orleans. It was not nearly as successful.
6. I am now in a position of personal responsibility as a chairperson with official designation for work next year.
7. It was of no help to our institution at this time but very helpful to me personally. I have no question but that the money spent on both ends was well spent.
8. This was one of the most valuable experiences to me personally.
9. It was very valuable personally as an educational experience.
10. This helped me a great deal.
11. I accomplished little beyond submission of a report of things I learned about to the faculty.
12. I really think, in all honesty, this was useful.
13. I enjoyed immensely meeting the other people.
14. I certainly valued the experience and feel the institution here will benefit. I thoroughly enjoyed the program and believe I personally benefited.

Present (June 1977) Operations

Attendees were asked: Were you enabled to better accomplish (institutional) change in then-existing operations? The following comments were received:

1. We have gone a long way from our earlier status in three months of development. The timing was excellent for moving us rapidly in our thinking.
2. No action has been taken beyond attempts to initiate action; institutional inflexibility is a problem.
3. We have no budgetary flexibility on a \$1,000,000 budget with 80% in salaries.
4. It has helped to administer a FIPSE fund. We are using priorities for granting requests and the software for keeping track of and control of activities. Faculty receipt of grants seems to have been acceptable and sharpened up. This is a good step forward.
5. We cannot use the UW-Oshkosh calendar.
6. I sent a letter to committee members and the faculty via a campus communication newsletter.
7. I wrote a long letter in response to a request for ideas and was invited to make a presentation to a faculty committee in followup.
8. I got a lot of help on how to write guidelines for faculty improvement leaves.
9. Speed grant guidelines were written (need money fast) and faculty development grants up to \$3000 were initiated.
10. I shared materials with the President, Provost and the Vice President. The President was very impressed by the materials.
11. We have added many features used at Oshkosh: (1) off-campus seminars, (2) financial grants, (3) curriculum development, and (4) independent research grants.
12. Our institution is tied up with a labor practices case. This has totally restricted action toward change.
13. I am functioning in a chairmanship role and continue to work on institutional policy development.
14. We now have about \$10,000 to spend on faculty development.
15. It helped a lot with our faculty development implementation committee. Our program has left the faculty senate as a parent body and gone to an institutional sponsorship.
16. It helped get the advisory committee set up. We also set up a manual for our program.

The Future

Attendees were asked: *Did you receive help to plan for future institutional change?* Two institutions could not comment but the following statements were received:

1. A professional group takes over the campus and restricts the summer.
2. I cannot see any benefits that may accrue in the future.
3. The faculty college "business" is possibly adaptable to a 3-week interval in our year. I expect a more general impact over time rather than any specific action.
4. We may be able to get things done next year. We have built a proposal for change. At the committee and group discussion level there was a positive response.
5. Personal scheduling flexibility is now being pursued. A committee set up a proposal on this for more flexible scheduling. Also, the 2-Dimensional model Guetha showed has been added to and made 3-D. This is being debated and considered at this point.
6. A vice-provost is interested in more formal organization and activity. Much will apparently happen. If not as a direct and sole result of Oakkosh, then at least it will have been facilitating.
7. We are going to bring in people for faculty development inservice (behavioral objectives, etcetera).
8. We are now faced with planning by the registrar for student commitment to long term registration (all 4 semesters planned in advance). Will send another person if the program is available again.
9. There has been no long range planning this far. The campus has hoped that state money can be acquired; then we would set up a committee and have a chairman with resources for action.
10. The quarter system may be changed to semesters.

APPENDIX B

October 3, 1978

Dr. William Mahler
Faculty Development
UN-Oshkosh
800 Algoma Blvd.
Oshkosh, WI 54901

Dear Dr. Mahler:

I am writing this letter to summarize outcomes to date of my attention to evaluation of your FIPSE program for faculty development services to other higher education institutions. The evaluative problems were to seek evidence of program effectiveness: (1) as attendees rated their campus attendance for study and planning and (2) as attendance might be related to subsequent events at the sponsoring institutions.

Because (1) a true experiment with randomization could not be arranged, (2) the number of attendees was small and (3) outcomes would arise over more than a year, I suggested a procedure be followed that promised to provide management planning experiences and also set a basis for evaluation. Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS), as described in articles in Evaluation Studies Review Annual, Volumes 1 and 3 was that device; you have, I believe, copies of each that I discussed with you on file.

Followup of attendees at your May 1977 and January 1978 workshops for faculty development continues. Several summary statements can be made at this time:

1. Ten of twelve 1977 attendees who produced a GAS profile have given me a summary of their goal attainment.
 - 1.1 All produced organized goals depicting important needs for institutional improvement. Their average GAS profile score at the time of the workshop was 36.02.
 - 1.2 All but one reported that there had been improvement in goal attainment over the year from 1977 to 1978. Their average GAS profile score one year later was 46.14. This indicates institutional progress (which may have been stimulated by your program) occurred and also, because 50 would be an "average" score, that much remained to be accomplished after one year.
2. In addition, thirteen of the twenty-three January 1978 attendees who set up a GAS profile have responded. Their activities have not been pursued long enough for effective followup but the initial profile also indicated substantial needs for development to exist at their institutions.
3. The two groups gave very similar subjective ratings to your program at Oshkosh. The numbers who assigned each of four effectiveness ratings was:

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Number</u>
Not very worthwhile	0
Somewhat worthwhile	2
Worthwhile	13
Very worthwhile	9

Narrative which accompanied numeric ratings are supportive of the view that the workshops were usually judged to be quite helpful for purposes of institutional planning.

I trust we can continue to do followup work with one or both groups and hope this summary helps you in the preparation of your final report.

Sincerely,


 Dr. Daniel F. Norton
 Evaluation Consultant

DPW:ph

APPENDIX C

Name _____

Institution _____

Position _____

1. Background

1. Please describe the present faculty development activities of your college/university.

2. Please describe your involvement in faculty development.

II. Plans

1. What new faculty development activities are being considered by your institution? What obstacles stand in the way of change occurring?

Possible change activity	Obstacles to change occurring
Activity 1:	
Activity 2:	
Activity 3:	
Activity 4:	

2. What incentives or strengths does your institution have for improving its faculty development activities?

Incentives:

Strengths:

3. What needs does your institution have for which new development is not now being considered?

Need 1:

Need 2:

Need 3:

Need 4:

III. Faculty College

1. Please rank the following Faculty College sessions (as described in the accompanying Context newspaper) according to their appeal to you. Please disregard the times (and possible conflicts) while doing these rankings. Then check the sessions which you plan to attend.

<u>Session</u>	<u>Rating</u>	<u>Plan to Attend?</u>
Efficient Reading	_____	_____
Pupils Into Scholars	_____	_____
Interpreting the Female Experience	_____	_____
Competency Based Education	_____	_____
Cartographic Display	_____	_____
Nursing Curriculum Design	_____	_____
Testing to Improve Instruction	_____	_____
Public Relations Through the Media	_____	_____
Experiential Education Seminar	_____	_____
Experiential Education Workshop	_____	_____
University/High School Cooperative Programs	_____	_____
Photography for Instruction	_____	_____
The Oshkosh Calendar Plan	_____	_____X_____
Non-Academic Curriculum	_____	_____
Careers for College Graduates	_____	_____
Publishing Articles and Papers	_____	_____
Assessing Academic Program Value	_____	_____
Human Relations	_____	_____
Graduate Education	_____	_____
Social Science Curriculum	_____	_____
Successful Grant Proposals	_____	_____
The Non-Traditional Student	_____	_____

3. With which UP-O faculty members or administrators would you like to have a personal discussion?

4. When will you be arriving at the Oshkosh airport?
(He will pick you up at the airport.)
Date _____ Time _____ Flight No. _____

5. When do you plan to leave? Date _____

6. Will you be staying on-campus for either the weekend of Jan. 8-9 or the weekend of Jan. 15-16? He will plan activities for you if you will be staying.

APPENDIX D
SURVEY OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

Code No. _____

- I. Listed below are a number of practices that might be used to help faculty develop in their variety of roles, particularly as teachers. Would you please indicate the extent to which the practice is used at your institution and your estimation of how effective it has been as a development practice. The extent of use is, of course, not necessarily equivalent to how worthwhile it has been. A practice may be very effective even though used by only a small portion of the faculty (or vice versa).

Extent to which it is used at your institution.

- 0 Not used (or not available)
- 1 Used by fewer than 5 percent of the faculty
- 2 Used by about 5-20 percent of the faculty
- 3 Used by about 20-50 percent of the faculty
- 4 Used by over 50 percent of the faculty

If used, how effective or worthwhile do you think it has been at your institution as a development practice.

- 0 Absolutely no idea of its effectiveness
- 1 Not very effective (or worthwhile)
- 2 Somewhat effective
- 3 Effective
- 4 Very effective (or worthwhile)

Practice
(If you would like to comment about any practice, please do so below)

Approximate Use
(Circle one response in each row)

Estimation of Effectiveness
(Respond only if used)

- A. Workshops, Seminars, Program (Disregard box at left of each practice until you reach Part III of the questionnaire.)

- | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| ☐ 1. Workshops or presentations that explore various methods or techniques of instruction. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 2. Workshops, seminars, or short courses that review subject matter or introduce new knowledge in a field. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 3. Workshops or seminars dealing with new or different approaches to develop curricula. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 4. Workshops or seminars on testing and evaluating student performance. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 5. Workshops, seminars, or program to acquaint faculty with goals of the institution and types of students enrolled. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 6. Workshops or program to help faculty improve their academic advising and counseling skills. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 7. Workshops or seminars to help faculty improve their research and scholarship skills. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 8. Workshops, seminars, or program to improve the management of departmental operations. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 9. Workshops or presentations that explore general issues or trends in education. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |
| ☐ 10. Workshops or program in faculty effective development--improving their interpersonal skills or their ability to work effectively in groups, exploring educational values, and similar topics. | 0 1 2 3 4 | 0 1 2 3 4 |

Other workshops, seminars, etc. (please list and comment on use and effectiveness).
Comments about above practices:

Appropriate Use
(Circle one response
in each row)

Effectiveness
(Respond only if used)

Practice

(If you would like to comment about any practice,
please do so below.)

B. Analysis or Assessment Practices

	Not used	Fewer than 5%	About 5-20%	About 20-50%	Over 50%	Absolutely no idea	Not very effective	Somewhat effective	Effective	Very effective
☐ 1. Systematic ratings of instruction by students used to help faculty improve.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 2. Formal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement (i.e., visitations or use of assessment form).	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 3. Informal assessments by colleagues for teaching or course improvement.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 4. Systematic teaching or course evaluations by an administrator for improvement purposes.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 5. System for faculty to assess their own strengths and areas needing improvement.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 6. Classroom visitation by an instructional resource person (i.e., a development specialist), upon request, followed by a diagnosis of teaching.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 7. Analysis of in-class video tapes to improve instruction.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 8. Faculty with expertise consult with other faculty on teaching or course improvement.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 9. "Master teachers" or senior faculty work closely with new or apprentice teachers.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 10. Professional and personal development plan (sometimes called a growth contract) for individual faculty members.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4

Other types of analysis or assessment practices (list with estimates of use and effectiveness). Comments about above practices:

C. Media, Technology, Course Development

☐ 1. Specialists on campus to assist faculty in use of audiovisual aids in instruction, including closed-circuit television.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 2. Assistance to faculty in use of instructional technology as a teaching aid (e.g., programmed learning or computer-assisted instruction).	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 3. Specialists to assist faculty in constructing tests or evaluating student performance.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 4. Specialists to assist individual faculty in instructional or course development by consulting on course objectives and course design.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 5. Specialists to help faculty develop teaching skills such as lecturing or leading discussions, or to encourage use of different teaching-learning strategies such as individualized instruction.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 6. Simulated procedures which enable faculty to learn and practice specific teaching skills (e.g., micro-teaching).	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 7. Special professional library readily accessible to faculty dealing with instructional methodology, teaching skills, psychology of learning, and similar topics.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4

Other types of media, technology, or course development practices. Comments about above practices:

Approximate Use
(Circle one response in each row)

Effectiveness
(Respond only if used)

0. Miscellaneous Practices

	Not used	< 5%	5-20%	20-50%	> 50%	No idea	Not very effective	Somewhat effective	Effective	Very eff.
☐ 1. Use of grants by faculty members for developing new or different approaches to courses or teaching.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 2. Visitations to other institutions (or to other parts of this institution) to review educational programs or innovative projects.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 3. Faculty exchange program with other institutions.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 4. Faculty take courses offered by colleagues.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 5. Personal counseling provided individual faculty members on career goals, and other personal development areas.	0	1	2	3	4	0	1	2	3	4

Other miscellaneous practices. Comments about above practices:

- II. Please indicate whether your institution has each of the following practices or not. If yes, estimate its effectiveness on the same scale of one to four.

Respond only if practice exists

Practice (If you would like to comment about any practice, please do so below.)	1 = Practice exists	2 = Practice does not exist	0 Absolutely no idea of its effectiveness	1 Not very effective	2 Somewhat effective	3 Effective	4 Very effective
☐ 1. Annual awards to faculty for excellence in teaching.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 2. Circulation of newsletter, articles, etc. that are pertinent to teaching improvement or faculty development.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 3. A specific calendar period is set aside for professional development.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 4. There is a periodic review of the performance of all faculty members, whether tenured or not.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 5. Sabbatical leaves with at least half salary.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 6. A policy of unpaid leaves that covers educational or development purposes.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 7. Lighter than normal teaching load for first year faculty.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 8. Temporary teaching load reductions to work on a new course, major course revision, or research area.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 9. Travel grants to refresh or update knowledge in a particular field.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 10. Travel funds available to attend professional conferences.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 11. Visiting scholars program that brings people to the campus for short or long periods.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 12. Summer grants for projects to improve instruction or courses.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
☐ 13. There is a campus committee on faculty development.	1	2	0	1	2	3	4

Other practices. Comments about above practices:

- III. Are there practices that have not been adopted or are not widely used at your institution that you would consider essential to faculty development? Please use the list of practices provided under Parts I (A thru D) and II and select up to five by putting a check (✓) in the box to the left of the particular practice. Add any others here:

- 48
- IV. What proportion of each of the following groups of faculty members would you estimate has been generally most involved in development activities?

Approximate Proportion
(Circle one in each row)

	Very few	Some	About half	Most
1. Younger faculty in their first years of teaching.	1	2	3	4
2. Faculty with over 15 or 20 years of teaching experience.	1	2	3	4
3. Tenured faculty	1	2	3	4
4. Tenured faculty	1	2	3	4
5. Good teachers who want to get better	1	2	3	4
6. Faculty who really need to improve	1	2	3	4
7. Other (specify) _____	1	2	3	4

V. Funding

- A. Approximately what proportion of the total money spent for faculty development activities at your institution during the past year has come from each of the following sources. The total should add to 100 percent.

Write in approximate percentage

1. Institutional general fund	_____ %
2. Grant from federal government or foundation	_____ %
3. Direct funds from the state	_____ %
4. Other _____	_____ %
Should add to: 100%	

- B. What percent of the total annual institutional budget does #1 above represent. (Circle one.)

1. 0-1%	4. 8-10%
2. 2-4%	5. Over 10%
3. 5-7%	

- C. Has the proportion of the annual institutional budget used for faculty development (circle one):

- Increased over the past two years?
- Decreased over the past two years?
- Remained about the same?

VI. Organization

- A. Does your institution have an on-campus person or unit(s) for faculty development or instructional improvement (e.g., Office of Faculty Development, Instructional Resource Unit, Teaching Improvement Unit, etc.)?

- Yes
- No

- B. If yes, please list the title of the unit(s) and the number of full-time equivalent professional staff involved.

Title	number
_____	_____
_____	_____

- C. How long has it (have they) existed?

_____ (number of years)

- VII. Is your institution part of a consortium or regional group that concentrates on faculty development?

- Yes
- No

If yes, give the name. _____

- VIII. Has there been an evaluation of the faculty development program or activities at your institution?

- Yes
- No
- Only in part

If yes or in part, could you describe it below or provide a copy of the report if available?

IX. Institutional Characteristics (Circle one in each category)

- A. 1. Two-year institution
2. Four-year college
3. University (with doctoral programs)
4. Professional school, specify _____

- B. Source of control:

- Private
- Public

- C. Religious affiliation:

- None
- Protestant
- Catholic
- Other religious group

- D. Total student enrollment (full-time):

- Under 1000
- 1000-2500
- 2500-5000
- 5000-10,000
- 10,000-20,000
- Over 20,000

Name of institution _____

Your name _____

Title _____

Finally, we invite you to include additional comments about the faculty development program or practices at your institution--its basic strategy or emphasis, its most critical problems, etc. If there is a document that describes your program, you may want to forward a copy to us. Comments may be made on a separate sheet of paper.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION.

APPENDIX E
SAMPLE GOAL ATTAINMENT SCALES

✓ = Present status * = status expected in one year	Goal Area 1: To systematize what we are now doing (i.e., \$400,000 in 5 programs) % of Effort: <u>40</u>	Goal Area 2: To complete "MBO" with all faculty concerning their goals % of Effort: <u>20</u>	Goal Area 3: To complete planning for a small "new college" within the university % of Effort: <u>20</u>	Goal Area 4: To develop a more systematic program of grant-seeking % of Effort: <u>20</u>	Goal Area 5: % of Effort: _____
Best outcome possible	To get integrated criteria, forms, & deadlines for Sabbaticals, Faculty Improvement Grants, Research Grants, Travel Funds & Teaching/Learning Grants	To confer with 100% of faculty	To have a 4-yr. curriculum established, students admitted, and continuation funds obtained from the legislature	To score with the appropriate Titles & FIPSE in order to enhance our Continuing Educ. & Faculty Innovations	
More than expected success	To integrate all but travel (which is a faculty prerogative not likely surrendered)	To confer with all but the fixed term people	All but the legislative augmentation	4-5 grants	
Expected level of success	To lose on Travel and to lose present funding level for Teaching-Learning Grants *	To confer with all but the fixed term people and senior professors, the latter to be on a 2-yr. cycle	As above but with only a freshman curriculum intact * ✓	2-3 grants	
Less than expected success	To lose on all but Sabbatical and Research Grants ✓	To get to only the candidates for tenure/promotion *	To decide to delay admission of the first freshman until Sept. 1980	1 grant *	
Worst possible outcome * 50	To have the whole attempt blow up, to incur strong resistance with Faculty Association which would threaten future Faculty Development	To fail to begin these objective-setting sessions ✓	A decision made to abandon the experiment	Little submitted, none granted ✓	51